



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,734	04/30/2001	Walter Dixon III	345708003US	3801
28062	7590	10/14/2004	EXAMINER	
BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC			DAS, CHAMELI	
5 ELM STREET			ART UNIT	
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			PAPER NUMBER	
			2122	

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/845,734	Applicant(s) DIXON ET AL.	
	Examiner CHAMELI C DAS	Art Unit 2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2004.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2122

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 9/3/04.
2. Claims 1, 5, 17, and 37 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-45 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shorter, US 6,687,707.

As per amended claim 1, Shorter (US 6,687,707) discloses:

- indicating that the input attribute is resolved if the identified output attribute has been indicated as resolved , and indicating that the input attribute is not resolved if the identified output attribute has not been indicated as resolved (col 8, lines 47-67 and col 9, lines 1-15, "FIG. 5C depicts a high level flowchart for a general process of object attribute resolution in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. The process begins at step 520, which depicts receiving an object attribute resolution request and

Art Unit: 2122

accompanying input criteria for an attempted object attribute resolution with object attribute records within an object index in a host data processing system. The process then passes to step 522, which illustrates a determination of whether sufficient input criteria exist in the request to satisfy at least one combination specified in the input criteria table for reliable object attribute resolution. ***If not, the process proceeds to step 524, which depicts rejecting the request. If so, however, the process proceeds instead to step 526, which illustrates execution of the match determination process,*** and then to step 528, which depicts a determination of whether a match was found within the object index being searched. ***If a match is located within the object index*** maintained in the host data processing system, the process proceeds to step 530, which depicts returning the unique object identifier associated with the matching object attribute record within the object index. Otherwise, the process proceeds instead to step 532, which illustrates returning an indication of ***the match failure***. From any of steps 524, 530, or 532, the process passes to step 534, which illustrates the process becoming idle until another object attribute resolution request is again received... which depicts comparison of an input criteria attribute value to a corresponding object attribute record attribute value”), “***If a match is located within the object index*** maintained in the host data processing system, the process proceeds to step 530, which depicts returning the unique object identifier associated with the matching object attribute

record within the object index. Otherwise, the process proceeds instead to step 532, which illustrates returning an indication of ***the match failure***, ***inherently including*** “ indicating that the input attribute is resolved if the identified output attribute has been indicated as resolved , and indicating that the input attribute is not resolved if the identified output attribute has not been indicated as resolved” as recited in the claim.

For the rest of the limitations see the rejection of the previous office action.

As per claim 28, Shorter discloses “ determining whether a source of the input parameter would be resolved during execution of the computer program for each output parameter of the function, indicating that the output parameter is resolved wherein output parameters are sources of input parameters (col 7, lines 40-45, col 9, lines 50-67, col 10, lines 1-5, col 10, lines 47-60). Shorter also discloses processing each function of a computer program prior to runtime is shown in (col 11 lines 5-20).

6. For claims 2-27, and 29-45, see the rejections of the previous office action.

Response to the Arguments

7. Applicant's argument filed on 9/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In remarks, the applicant argues is substance:

(1) Regarding claim 1, Shorter describes various behaviors of a computer program during execution, but does not describe a process for examining a computer program before execution to determine whether there will be problems during execution.

Response:

(1) The above limitation is not cited in claim 1.

(2) Regarding claim 1, Shorter does not disclose “program is examined prior to execution to indicate whether attributes would be resolved during execution”.

Response:

(2) As per claim 1, Shorter discloses a method for determining resolution of attributes of a program (see the rejection of claim 1 above). Claim 1 does not recite the limitation “program is examined prior to execution to indicate whether attributes would be resolved during execution”.

(3) Regarding claim 5, Neither Shorter nor Balakrishnan disclose “indicating that input parameter is resolved if a corresponding output parameter has been indicated as a result of a function in the path of execution having previously been processed.”

Response:

(3) Balakrishnan discloses the method for providing a path of execution of the computer program, the path of execution identifying a sequence of functions of the computer program (column 4, lines 51-57, col 5, lines 13-20, column 13 lines 35-40, column 4, lines 34-57, column 14, lines 5-55, column 14, lines 5-55). Balakrishnan also discloses the method for resolving the attributes (column 14 lines 5-49).

Balakrishnan does not specifically disclose examining a program prior to execution. However, Shorter discloses examining a program prior to execution (Shorter, col 11, lines 5-20, col 8, lines 47-67, col 9, lines 1-15), “ The system administrator will have previously inserted into the administration file information indicating that the local object resolution services 302 should propagate the request to other object resolution services, such as object resolutions services 304 within data processing system 110” , clearly indicates that examining a program prior to execution as claimed.

(4) As per claim 12, the Balakrishnan and Shorter do not disclose “ input and output parameters correspond when they have that same name” .

Response:

(4) Shorter discloses the method for matching input and output attribute (col 9, lines 17-30), the attributes are the name of the object (col 7, lines 10-18).

(5) Neither Balakrishnan nor Shorter disclose the limitations recited in the independent claim 28.

Response:

(5) As per claim 28, Shorter discloses “ determining whether a source of the input parameter would be resolved during execution of the computer program for each output parameter of the function, indicating that the output parameter is resolved wherein output parameters are sources of input parameters (col 7, lines 40-45, col 9, lines 50-67, col 10, lines 1-5, col 10, lines 47-60). Shorter also discloses processing each function of a computer program prior to runtime is shown in (col 11 lines 5-20).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2122

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli C. Das whose telephone number is (703) 305-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-3:30.

After October 25, 2004, the examiner can be reached at new telephone number (571) 272-3696, and the examiner's supervisor Tuan Dam can be reached at (571) 272-3695.

An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Chameli C. Das
CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/5/09